



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/517,595	08/23/2005	Jan De Kroon	4662-304	9094
23117 7590 02/06/2008 NIXON & VANDERHYE, PC 901 NORTH GLEBE ROAD, 11TH FLOOR ARLINGTON, VA 22203				
			EXAMINER FREEMAN, JOHN D	
			ART UNIT 1794	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 02/06/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/517,595	<b>Applicant(s)</b> DE KROON ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> John Freeman	<b>Art Unit</b> 1794	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 December 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/ are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>12/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Double Patenting*

1. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

2. Claims 1, 2, 4 and 5 are provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 4 of copending Application No. 10/520704. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the applications describe multilayer structures that are substantially the same. The instant application claims a multilayer film comprising Applicant's described polyamide layer and another polymer layer, as well as the process of making a similar film, which is substantially the same as a laminate comprising a substrate and a layer of the same polyamide polymer as found in 10/520704.

Art Unit: 1794

Applicants attention is drawn to MPEP 804 where it is disclosed that "the specification can always be used as a dictionary to learn the meaning of a term in a patent claim." *In re Boylan*, 392 F.2d 1017, 157 USPQ 370 (CCPA 1968). Further, those portions of the specification which provide support for the patent claims may also be examined and considered when addressing the issue of whether a claim in an application defines an obvious variation of an invention claimed in the patent. (underlining added by examiner for emphasis) *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619,622 (CCPA 1970).

Consistent with the above underlined portion of the MPEP citation, attention is drawn to page 2, lines 30-31 of 10/520704, which discloses the use of a plastic-film substrate, and page 3, lines 11-12, which discloses polyethylene as a compatible material with the polyamide layer, to impart properties, e.g. heat-seal, or barrier properties, to foodstuffs packaging containing the polyamide.

In light of the above, it therefore would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a plastic-film, and particularly polyethylene, as a substrate in the 10/520704 and thereby arrive at the present invention.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

3. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

4. Claim 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed recitation of a process, without setting forth any steps involved in the process, results in an improper definition of a process, i.e., results in a claim which is not a proper process claim under 35 U.S.C. 101.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Cordes et al. (EP 0000363).
7. Citations herein refer to the provided machine translation, unless otherwise stated.
8. Cordes et al. (hereafter Cordes) disclose multilayer films containing polyamide and polyethylene (claim 8). The polyamide comprises  $\epsilon$ -caprolactam (p1, paragraph 8). Comonomers include adipic and terephthalic acid units, and trifunctional amines (p2, paragraph 2). The quantities of comonomeric units specified by Cortes (p2, paragraph

Art Unit: 1794

3, Example 1b; p3 paragraph 4) satisfy Applicant's formula (1). For Example 1b,  $P=0.998$ , which is less than  $(1/[(F_A-1) \cdot (F_B-1)]) = 42 \cdot 10^3$ . The examiner notes that Cordes describes a gel-free polyamide, just as Applicant describes (p 2, paragraph 4). A layer of polyethylene is coextruded with the polyamide (p3, paragraph 6). An adhesive layer is between the two layers, but the examiner considers this situation to remain within the scope of the term "adjacent". The film is flattened by rollers (p3, paragraph 7).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nijenhuis et al. (WO 00/35992) in view of Van Marcke (US 5975359).

11. Nijenhuis et al. (hereafter Nijenhuis) disclose randomly branched polyamides conforming to the formulae outlined by Applicant (p2 ln 29-p3 ln 32). The polyamides are suitable for films and molded articles (p7 ln 13).

12. Nijenhuis is silent, however, with regard to a multilayer film as claimed by applicant.

13. Multilayer films of polyamide and polyethylene are well-known in the art. For example, Van Marcke discloses a laminated sheet (Fig. 3) of polyamide 52 and polyethylene 54 (col 4 ln 14-17). Van Marcke even suggests that one seeking lower melting temperatures should use non-linear polyethylene (col 4 ln 42-45).

Art Unit: 1794

14. At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the polyamide layer of Nijenhuis with a polyethylene layer to make a film. Structures comprising polyamide and polyethylene are well-known in the art as evidenced by Van Marcke. They are useful because the polyamide layer is a good gas barrier while polyethylene is a good moisture barrier. It further would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to try non-linear polyethylene in the course of optimizing such a film; non-linear polyethylene has different rheological and melting properties compared to other forms of polyethylene.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

15. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

16. Claims 1-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

17. Claims 1-4 provide for the process of producing a multilayer flat film, but, since the claims do not set forth any steps involved in the method/process, it is unclear what method/process applicant is intending to encompass. A claim is indefinite where it merely recites a process without any active, positive steps delimiting how this process is actually practiced.

***Conclusion***

The examiner notes that references cited in the international search report are relevant, but not directly pertinent at this time.

18. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Schmitz et al. ('352) disclose a polyamide and polyolefin structure which is well known in the art.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to John Freeman whose telephone number is (571)270-3469. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 7:30-5:00PM EST (First Friday off).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Callie Shosho can be reached on (571)272-1123. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 1794

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

John Freeman  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1794

/J. F./  
Examiner, Art Unit 4174

Callie Shosho  
Callie Shosho  
Supervisory Patent Examiner